

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

RAYMOND A. WATTERSON,

Plaintiff, No. 10-cv-060-JE

v.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner
of Social Security,

ORDER

Defendant.

HERNANDEZ, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Jelderks issued a Findings and Recommendation (#34) on November 16, 2011, in which he recommends the Court affirm the Commissioner's decision to deny plaintiff's applications for Supplemental Security Income and Disability Insurance Benefits.

Plaintiff has timely filed objections to the Findings and Recommendation. The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).

When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Dawson v. Marshall, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009); United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc).

I have carefully considered plaintiff's objections and conclude that the objections do not provide a basis to modify the Findings and Recommendation. I have also reviewed the pertinent portions of the record *de novo* and find no error in the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation.

CONCLUSION

The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Jelderks's Findings and Recommendation [#34] and, therefore, the Commissioner's decision is affirmed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 30th day of January, 2012.

/s/ Marco A. Hernandez
MARCO A. HERNANDEZ
United States District Judge